REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 9-12, and 17 are presently active, claims 5-8, 13-16, and 18-21 having been cancelled by this Amendment.

In the Office Action dated 19 May 2004 ("Office Action"), claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 17, 18, 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Chan, et al., US patent 5,412,689 ("Chan"); claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 9-16, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan.

All presently active independent claims are amended to recite that n is a positive integer greater than one. All presently active claims are believed to satisfy 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Originally presented claim 5 recited the limitation that "for each $i = 1,...,n$, receiver $r(i)$ provides an estimate of $d(i)$ based upon the signal $x(i)$ independently of $x(j)$ for $j \neq i$." This limitation is neither taught nor suggested by Chan. For the rejection of claim 5, in the Office Action, page 3, reference was made to Chan, column 8, lines 30 to column 9, line 17. But upon reading this section of Chan, it is clear that the receivers do not meet the recited claim limitation because a receiver as taught by Chan requires voltages from more than one transmission line. For example, Chan teaches at column 8, line 30, that "[d]ecoding circuit 70 includes modal line receivers 72 which accept transmitted line voltages EA, EB, EC, ED and convert a received signal to a corresponding orthogonal mode signal." As seen in Fig. 5 of Chan, voltages EA, EB, EC, and ED are the voltages from the four transmission lines. Each output signal voltage (see block 76 in Fig. 5 of Chan) utilizes all of these voltages.

But for claim 5 of the present application, a receiver need only process the signal on its corresponding transmission line to provide an estimate of the received data. The receiver does not use the signals on the other transmission lines.

All presently active independent claims now include the limitation of originally presented claim 5. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all presently active claims are patentable over the cited art.

Respectfully submitted,

Seth Z. Kalson   Dated: _8-25-04_

Seth Z. Kalson
Reg. no. 40,670
Attorney for Intel Corporation (Assignee)